REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-31. Claims 1-16 and 24-31 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Bartroli and further in view of Krishnan. Claims 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Bartroli. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons previously discussed during prosecution and the following:

The Applicants first turn to the rejection of claims 1-16 and 24-31 as being unpatentable over Summers in view of Bartroli and Krishnan. Claim 1 recites, in part, "distance mapping from a reference axis said display index values from the first set of data to a third set of data." Independent claims 9 and 24 recite similar limitations.

The Office Action relies on Summers as disclosing the limitations noted above. *See* April 15, 2008 Office Action at page 5. In particular, the Office Action states that the "3D color encoded polyp image as shown in Fig. 3b is surface unfolded to produce the 2D visual display as shown in Fig. 1b." *See id.*

However, Summers does not describe, teach or suggest that anything from the images in Figure 3b is mapped to anything in Figure 1b. Figure 3 of Summer represents an "anteroposterior view of the three-dimensional surface rendering of the colon bearing 10 simulated polyps… [and] a shape analysis of the colon with color encoding." *See* Summers at page 286, column 3.

Figure 1b, on the other hand, is a view showing the method of polyp detection in a simplified fashion for the sake of clarity. *See id.* at column 1. Summers in no way discloses that Figure 1b is any type of reconfiguration of the images in Figure 3. There simply is no mention in Summers that Figure 3 is in any way related to Figure 1b. That is, Summers clearly does not describe, teach or suggest that any portion of Figure 3 (or data from the images of Figures 3) is mapped onto Figure 1 (or data of the hypothetical images of Figure 1), or vice versa. Indeed, Figure 1 of Summers merely is a hypothetical representation of a portion of a colon that is used to clearly and simply show the method of polyp detection. However, Figure 1 of Summers is not related to the actual three dimensional surface rendered images shown in Figure 3. In particular, Summers states the following:

Figure 1. ***Illustration of shape-based colonic polyp detection.*** **(a)** ***In a hypothetical portion of the colonic surface,*** there are two polyps (arrows), one on a fold (small arrow) and the other between two folds (larger arrow). **(b)** After the polyp-detection algorithm is applied, the surface is color coded to indicate regions of different shapes.

Id. at page 285 (emphasis added).

As Summers clearly points out, the images shown in Figures 1a and 1b are of a **hypothetical** colon portion. That is, they are merely being shown to clearly and simply illustrate the method of polyp detection. *See id.* at pages 286 column 1 ("The principle behind the method is shown in Figure 1."). However, the images of the hypothetical colon portion are **not** related to the actual "anteroposterior three-dimensional surface-rendered images of colon" of Figure 3. Particularly, nothing shown in Figure 3 of Summers is mapped to Figure 1 of Summers (or vice versa), nor does Summers describe, teach or suggest as much. Indeed, there is absolutely nothing in Summers that correlates the hypothetical colonic surface portion images of Figure 1 with the actual images shown in Figure 3. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Summers does not describe, teach or suggest that the "color encoded polyp image as shown in Fig. 3b is surface unfolded to produce the 2D visual display as shown in Fig. 1b" (as asserted in the Office Action). Instead, Figure 1 of Summers merely shows a simplified image to illustrate the "principle behind the method of polyp detection "using software with a prototypic automated polyp detector that identifies regions of the colon wall with abnormal shape." *See* Summers at page 286, column 1. As such, Figures 1b and 3 of Summers do not describe, teach or suggest "distance mapping from a reference axis said display index values from the first set of data to a third set of data," as recited in claims 1, 9 and 24.

The Applicants next turn to the rejection of claims 17-23 as being rendered unpatentable by Summers in view of Bartroli. The Office Action states the following: "(see Figs. 3b and 1b, the 3D color encoded polyp image as shown in Fig. 3b is surface unfolded to produce the 2d visual display as shown in Fig. 1b…". *See* April 15, 2008 Office Action at page 9.

As detailed above, however, Summers does not describe, teach or suggest that anything in Figure 3 is used to produce the hypothetical image of Figure 1b, or vice

versa. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection.

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding the pending claims and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the Applicants will not address such statements at the present time. The Applicants expressly reserve the right, however, to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statement should become relevant by appearing in a future claim rejection).

The Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicants can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

While no fee is believed to be due, the Commissioner is, nevertheless, authorized to charge any necessary fees, or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of GTC, Account No. 070845.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2008

/Joseph M. Butscher/
Joseph M. Butscher
Registration No. 48,326

MCANDREWS, HELD, & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100